

From: evelyn_elder@mail.fws.gov
Date: Mon, 09 Jun 97 16:07:16 -0700
To: <bpine@water.ca.gov>, <jkelly@water.ca.gov>,
<sgross@water.ca.gov>
Subject: Comments on Watershed Mgtmt Framework and Phase II alts.

I'm trying to send this under a new gateway which is supposed to help with attachments. Will also send via FAX as soon as I get it printed out. Bob, I had a delay while they were working on my computer. Jean

Forward Header

Subject: Comments on Watershed Mgtmt Framework and Phase II alts.
Author: Robert Pine at 1PO-SCES2
Date: 6/4/97 2:58 PM

Judy,

Here are comments I have received on draft CALFED Watershed Management Framework and Phase II alternatives (also see attached):

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

Jean/Bob

I have all kinds of problem with 'and will be consistent with'.

Unless CALFED is consistent with our authorities we can not agree to that language. A simple 'coordinate with' should be OK.

Wayne

"All CALFED agency activities that are pertinent to the CALFED mission of addressing the problems of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta should be fully coordinated with, and be consistent with, the CALFED program."

ALTERNATIVES DOCUMENT

The document should include a water needs analysis and provide supply and demand information. Using water needs analysis information, including all in-basin needs (bay-delta water quality/outflows, instream flows, water rights, water allocations, etc.), the targeted available supplies can be identified and an appropriate response to capture flows can then be prepared. Without this information building structures to capture water is difficult to conceptualize. If the goal of CALFED alternatives is to meet the 2020 projected state-wide water need the document should clearly note the intent.

In regard to the common program, it should be added that although the goal of the common program is to improve target resource areas, that these improvements do not affect species and their habitats equally and that in some cases there are adverse affects to aquatic and terrestrial species and habitats that result from the common program. This is important when comparing the effects of the alternatives on various habitats and species since the common program may be an additional adverse effect to these habitats and species.

Appendix F--Existing conditions

Additions to Assumptions:

Winter Run Biological Opinion: If upstream provisions are going to be represented, then the Delta provisions currently in effect, namely the closure of the cross channel gates Feb01-Apr30, should be represented as well.

CVPIA: If upstream provisions are going to be represented, they should be documented as highly preliminary, subject to change, rather than hard and fast guidance given in an official USBR letter. Secondly, if upstream AFRP proposed actions are going to be represented, then it seems logical that Delta AFRP proposed actions be represented. Thirdly, upstream AFRP proposed action on the Stanislaus is missing and should be added.

Attachment Converted: "c:\eudora\attach\watershe.fmw"

Attachment Converted: "c:\eudora\attach\guideli1.wpd"

Attachment Converted: "c:\eudora\attach\alternat.com"